



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,490	07/23/2003	Ralf Vierich	08005.0010	7823
22852	7590	06/28/2007	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			AHN, SANGWOO	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2166		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/624,490	VIERICH ET AL.	
	Examiner Sangwoo Ahn	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/2/2007 has been entered.

Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131

The declaration filed on 3/1/2007 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Thomson reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference (December 17, 2001).

As for Exhibit A, Applicants stated that it is created on July 31, 2001 and updated throughout to January 15, 2002. From the second page ("Detailed History of Changes," which shows no actual disclosure of the invention) of the document, the Examiner could see that the Version 1.0 was created and subsequently updated to Version 1.1 prior to December 17, 2001. However, the portion of the document that actually contains the disclosure is dated as "v10 2002-01-15," which indicates that it is Version 10 and created after December 17, 2001. Therefore, this document is insufficient to establish a

reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference.

Exhibit B is a screen capture of the properties of the document discussed above, which shows Author, Revision Number, Date created, Date last saved, etc. Even though it appears that the document was created on July 31, 2001, Date Last Saved shows that the document was last saved after December 17, 2001. This suggests that the document could have been edited between the date created and the date last saved. Therefore, this document is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference.

As for Exhibit C, there is no showing within the document that it was written or finalized before December 17, 2001. Rather, it appears from the date indicated on the first page of the document that the document was in fact finalized on January 28, 2002. Therefore, this document is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference.

Exhibit D is a screen capture of the properties of the document discussed above, which shows Author, Revision Number, Date created, Date last saved, etc. Instead of showing a date prior to the effective date of the Thomson Reference, this screen capture seems to prove that the document was created after December 17, 2001 because Date Created shows January 25, 2002. Therefore, this document is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference.

As for Exhibit E, there is no showing within the document that it was written or finalized before December 17, 2001. Therefore, this document is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference.

Exhibit F is a screen capture of the properties of the document discussed above, which shows Author, Revision Number, Date created, Date last saved, etc. Instead of showing a date prior to the effective date of the Thomson Reference, this screen capture seems to prove that the document was created after December 17, 2001 because Date Created shows February 25, 2002. Therefore, this document is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference.

For the forgoing reasons, it is submitted that the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Thomson reference (December 17, 2001).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 – 17, 19 – 20, 24 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomson et al.

With respect to claim1, Thomson discloses,

In a decision support system, a system for accessing data comprising:

- (a) means for generating drill-through paths, each of the drill-through path comprising at least one relationship, each relationship comprising a parameter mapping between a source and a target (paragraph 13 lines 1 – 4: drill-through, paragraph 14 lines 3 – 7: parameter mapping, paragraph 40: drill-through, paragraph 51 lines 1 – 8: drill-through and mapping, paragraph 52: drill-through relationship and mapping, et seq.);
- (b) means for accepting a request from a user (paragraph 6 lines 1 – 5, paragraph 21 lines 2 – 3, paragraph 56 line 3, et seq.);
- (c) means for translating the request into selection of a drill-through path from a plurality of possible drill-through paths between the source and the target (paragraph 62 lines 1 – 13, et seq.);
- (d) means for requesting data using the selected drill-through path (paragraph 62 lines 1 – 13, et seq.); and
- (e) display means for displaying the requested data to the user (Figure 9, paragraph 55 lines 1 – 3, paragraph 62 lines 9 – 13, et seq.).

With respect to claim 2, Thomson discloses,

A computer-based method for obtaining data from one or more compatible data sources for use within applications implementing a decision support system, the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) modeling a mapping of data between a source and a target to produce one or more possible drill-through paths between the source and the target, each of the one or more possible drill-through paths comprising at least one relationship, each relationship comprising a parameter mapping between the source and the target (paragraph 13 lines 1 – 4: drill-through, paragraph 14 lines 3 – 7: parameter mapping, paragraph 40: drill-through, paragraph 51 lines 1 – 8: drill-through and mapping, paragraph 52: drill-through relationship and mapping, et seq.);
- (b) accepting a request from a user for data (paragraph 6 lines 1 – 5, paragraph 21 lines 2 – 3, paragraph 56 line 3, et seq.);
- (c) translating the request into selection of a drill-through path from the possible drill-through paths between the source and the target (paragraph 62 lines 1 – 13, et seq.);
- (d) applying one or more parameters to the relationships in the selected drill-through path to produce a valid parameter mapping (paragraphs 16 – 18, 56 – 57, et seq.);
- (e) transferring the requested data over the valid parameter mapping to an application (paragraphs 55 and 62, et seq.); and

(f) displaying the requested data to a user (Figure 9, paragraph 55 lines 1 – 3, paragraph 62 lines 9 – 13, et seq.).

As per claim 5, Thomson discloses,

(a) creating a list of parameters from the source and the target (paragraph 53 lines 7 – 8, paragraph 62 lines 9 – 13, et seq.);

(b) determining, for each source parameter, the parameter mapping that maps the parameter to the target (Figure 5 element 504, paragraph 21, paragraph 14 lines 3 – 7, paragraph 52 lines 6 – 9, et seq.);

(c) collecting the parameter mappings as a single drill-through path (paragraphs 21, 51 – 52, et seq.);

if more than one parameter mapping point to the same target parameter then

(d) duplicating the parameter mapping one for each duplicate target path, thereby avoiding conflict in forming a filter until all the parameter mappings for each drill-through path point to unique target parameters (paragraphs 139 – 161, et seq.).

As per claim 6, Thomson discloses,

the source and the target are each of types which are selected from a group consisting of report and model (paragraphs 13, 17, 45, 51 – 52).

As per claim 7, Thomson discloses,

the source is of a type selected from a group consisting of report and model and the target is a cube derived from a dimension map using a transformation tool (Figure 5, paragraphs 13 – 17, 51 – 52).

As per claim 8, Thomson discloses,

the drill-through path is defined by Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (paragraphs 93, 118).

As per claim 9, Thomson discloses,

the drill-through pat is defied by an HTML FORM (paragraphs 51, 90).

Claims 10 – 15 are essentially the same as claims 2 and 5 – 9 and rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claims 2 and 5 – 9 rejections.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 10 except it sets forth the limitation as “computer executable software code” rather than “computer-based system”, therefore rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claim 10 rejection.

As per claim 19, Thomson discloses,

within one or more of the possible drill-through paths, relationships having one or more parameters (paragraph 13 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 14 lines 3 – 7, paragraph 40, paragraph 51 lines 1 – 8, paragraph 52, et seq.).

Claims 24 – 25 are rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claim 19 rejection.

As per claim 20, Thomson discloses,

within one or more of the possible drill-through paths, relationships wherein at least the source is defined using meta-data contained in a meta-data model (paragraph 95 lines 1 – 6, et seq.).

Claims 26 – 27 are rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claim 20 rejection.

As per claim 28, Thomson discloses,

Art Unit: 2166

means for converting data during a drill-through operation (paragraph 131 lines 12 – 14, et seq.).

Claims 30 – 31 are rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claim 30 rejection.

As per claim 29, Thomson discloses,

at least one relationship includes a parameter mapping between the source and the target and data conversion functions (paragraph 13 lines 1 – 4, paragraph 14 lines 3 – 7, paragraph 40, paragraph 51 lines 1 – 8, paragraph 52, paragraph 131 lines 12 – 14, et seq.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18 and 21 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomson in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,682,526 issued to Timothy L. Smokoff et al (hereinafter "Smokoff").

As per claim 18, Thomson discloses the system of claim 1 and, parameters, relationships, drill-through paths, as discussed above under 35 U.S.C. 102 section.

Thomson does not explicitly disclose the use of one or more "placeholders" and replacing the placeholder by user supplied parameter.

However, Smokoff discloses the use of one or more "placeholders" and replacing the placeholder by user supplied parameter (column 3 lines 58 – 60, et seq.). At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the data processing art to combine the two references because Smokoff's method of using "placeholders" would have enabled Thomson's overall system to flexibly organize, record, and display information, and provide users to customize information hierarchy in a way that is optimized for the structure and procedures of an organization.

Claims 21 – 23 are rejected based on the same rationale discussed in claim 18 rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sangwoo Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-5626. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Patent Examiner Sangwoo Ahn
AU 2166

6/20/2007 SW


MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER